R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 019 745 EA 001 337

SELECTED ORGANIZATIONAL VALUES AND CHARACTERISTICS OF INNOVATIVE AND NON-INNOVATIVE SCHOOL SYSTEMS.

BY- BICKERT, RODERICK
IOWA UNIV., IOWA CITY, IOWA CTR. FOR RES. SCH.ADM.

PUB DATE FEB 68

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.28 5P.

DESCRIPTORS- *TEACHER ATTITUDES, *ADMINISTRATOR ATTITUDES, *EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION, *PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEMS, INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS, TEACHER ADMINISTRATOR RELATIONSHIP, BOARD ADMINISTRATOR RELATIONSHIP, MOTIVATION, *BOARDS OF EDUCATION, IOWA CITY,

THIS STUDY WAS CONCERNED WITH DETERMINING WHETHER CERTAIN SELECTED VALUES AND CHARACTERISTICS WERE SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT FOR INNOVATIVE SCHOOLS AS OPPOSED TO NON-INNOVATIVE SCHOOLS. VALUES AND CHARACTERISTICS WERE EXAMINED IN RELATION TO THREE CATEGORIES--INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS, FACULTY-ADMINISTRATION-BOARD RELATIONS, AND MOTIVATIONAL ASPECTS. A LIST OF INNOVATIVE AND NON-INNOVATIVE SCHOOL SYSTEMS IN IOWA, DEVELOPED BY A PANEL OF JUDGES FROM THE IOWA STATE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, WAS SCREENED AND MATCHED ACCORDING TO THE TOTAL POPULATIONS OF THE COMMUNITIES SERVED. MAIL QUESTIONNAIRE DATA FROM A RANDOM SAMPLE OF STAFF MEMBERS, SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, AND ADMINISTRATORS IN 20 SCHOOLS REVEALED THAT (1) IN ALL THREE CATEGORIES, GROUPS REPRESENTING INNOVATIVE SCHOOLS RESPONDED IN A SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT MANNER THAN DID GROUPS REPRESENTING NON-INNOVATIVE SCHOOLS, (2) RESPONSES FROM CLASSROOM TEACHERS YIELDED THE MOST SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE SCORES BETWEEN THOSE REPRESENTING INNOVATIVE AND THOSE REPRESENTING NON-INNOVATIVE SCHOOLS, (3) SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS PROVIDED THE LEAST SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE SCORES BETWEEN THOSE REPRESENTING INNOVATIVE AND THOSE REPRESENTING NON-INNOVATIVE SCHOOLS, AND (4) ITEMS WHICH APPEARED TO PROVIDE THE GREATEST DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS REPRESENTING INNOVATIVE AND NON-INNOVATIVE SCHOOLS WERE LEADERSHIP FOR IMPROVEMENT OF INSTRUCTION, QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION, SCOPE OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS, FACULTY-BOARD ROLES IN ACADEMIC AFFAIRS, BOARD-ADMINISTRATION ROLES IN POLICY MAKING, COMMUNICATION ADEQUACY, OVERALL INTELLECTUAL CLIMATE AND STIMULATION, STIMULUS TO EXPERIMENTATION AND INNOVATION BY INDIVIDUAL TEACHERS, AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR FACULTY ADVANCEMENT. THIS DOCUMENT APPEARS IN THE "RESEARCH DIGEST" OF THE IOWA CENTER FOR RESEARCH IN SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION, NUMBER 36, FEBRUARY 1968. (HM)

ED019745

THE IOWA CENTER FOR RESEARCH IN SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION

The University of Iowa

Iowa City, Iowa

Research Digest

Number 36

SELECTED ORGANIZATIONAL VALUES AND CHARACTERISTICS OF INNOVATIVE AND NON-INNOVATIVE SCHOOL SYSTEMS

by

Roderick Bickert

Prepared for

tTHE IOWA CENTER FOR RESEARCH IN SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION

Dr. Willard R. Lane, Director

University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa
February 1968

EA 001 337

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SELECTED ORGANIZATIONAL VALUES AND CHARACTERISTICS OF INNOVATIVE AND NON-INNOVATIVE SCHOOL SYSTEMS

Central Problem and Sub-Problems

This study was concerned with determining whether certain selected values and characteristics were significantly different for innovative schools as opposed to non-innovative schools. These values and characteristics were examined in relationship to three major categories: The Instructional Program; Faculty-Administration-Board Relations; and, Motivational Aspects.

The sub-problem involved in this study was to determine whether or not significant differences existed in the three groups (teachers, administrators, and board members) in each type of school (innovative and non-innovative) selected to respond to the evaluation instrument.

Method

Acting on the assumption that the responsibilities of the State Department of Public Instruction were such as to place it in a position to identify innovative practices in the schools, the writer used a panel of judges from the State Department to develop a list of 13 innovative and 13 non-innovative school systems in the State of Iowa. This list was then screened to 10 schools in each category and matched as closely as possible according to the total population of the communities which they served. The final screening was completed with the assistance of a second panel of judges made up of Professors of Education in the Division of Educational Administration, University of Iowa. After securing the cooperation of the superintendent of each of these 20 schools, the author established a random sample of staff members, school board members and administrators for the administration of his survey instrument. Statistical techniques appropriate to compensate for the differences in size of schools and the limited number of administrators in the small schools were employed. Care was also taken to represent a cross section of senior high, junior high and elementary school staff members.

The questionnaire used in this study was developed by the writer. A pre-test in two public schools was used to refine the instrument, along with suggestions from school administrators, professors of education, school board members and advanced graduate students in education. The questionnaire was administered by mail and consisted of four major divisions: (1) general information about the respondent, (2) information concerning the instructional program, (3) information concerning faculty-administration-board relations in the school, and (4) information concerning motivational aspects of the school.

The information obtained in division one was used only for purposes of identifying the position of the respondent in the school system. In each of the other divisions, those being sampled were expected to make judgments on specific items in terms of two personal

perceptions: (1) What value was placed on each specific item by their particular school system, and (2) How satisfied they were with the efforts of their school system concerning these items. This produced a two column response form ("value" and "effort") over 17 specific items such as "providing released time for curriculum development," "opportunities for faculty advancement" or "faculty-board roles in academic affairs."

The information thus collected was then divided into categories by position (teacher, administrator, board member) for innovative and non-innovative schools. Scores for each type of school on each item were treated statistically to ascertain: (1) whether or not there were significant differences between innovative and non-innovative schools on these selected values and characteristics and, (2) whether or not significant differences existed from group to group within each type of school on these values and characteristics.

Findings

The study revealed that in all three major classifications (instructional program, faculty-administration-board relations, motivational aspects) groups representing innovative schools responded in a significantly different manner than did groups representing non-innovative schools. No statistically significant differences between groups representing teachers, administrators and board members were noted for either innovative or non-innovative schools.

A detailed examination of the findings reveals that: (1) significant differences between groups representing innovative and non-innovative schools were found in all items of the instrument; (2) responses from classroom teachers yielded the most significant difference scores between those representing innovative and those representing non-innovative schools; (3) school administrators provided the least significant difference scores between those representing innovative and those representing non-innovative schools; (4) the items which appeared to provide the greatest differences between groups representing innovative and non-innovative schools were:

A. In the area of instructional program

   1. Leadership for improvement of instruction
   2. Quality of instruction
   3. Scope of the educational program

B. In the area of faculty-administration-board relations

   1. Faculty-board roles in academic affairs
   2. Board-administration roles in policy making
   3. Communication adequacy

C. In the area of motivational aspects

1. Overall intellectual climate and stimulation
2. Encouraging experimentation and innovation on the part of the individual teachers
3. Opportunities for faculty advancement

Each of the above items was viewed in a significantly different way by those from innovative vs. non-innovative schools in regard to the value placed on it, and the effort expended to achieve it by the school system.

Conclusions

The author, after examining the findings of his study, suggests that the following conclusions are reasonably clear:

1. Distinct differences did appear to exist in the instructional program, faculty-administration-board relations, and motivational aspects of innovative and non-innovative school systems.

2. Classroom teachers, more than school administrators or school board members, appeared to have distinct feelings concerning the items being evaluated. Classroom teachers from innovative school systems showed a relatively high degree of satisfaction with the instructional program in their schools, while those in non-innovative schools appeared relatively dissatisfied with many of the motivational aspects and the instructional program of their systems. There also appeared to be some dissatisfaction with certain items under faculty-administration-board relationships from both groups of teachers, although there was a significant difference here between those in innovative and those in non-innovative school systems.

3. School board members and school administrators exhibited differences in judgments concerning the items being evaluated with administrators from both innovative and non-innovative schools showing a high degree of uniformity in their views.

4. School administrators from both types of schools seemed to be reasonably satisfied with their instructional programs. They were also similar in their views of faculty-administration-board relations, except for significant differences regarding the roles of the board and the administration in policy making and in the value placed on faculty-board roles in academic affairs. Administrators from both innovative and non-innovative schools responded similarly to items which refer to motivational aspects of their schools, except for the very marked concern shown by administrators of innovative schools for the overall intellectual climate and the value they place on encouraging experimentation by individual teachers.

5. School board members from innovative and non-innovative schools differed markedly in their views of the instructional program. Board members from innovative schools appeared more concerned about faculty-administrative-board relations than those from non-innovative schools. Both sets of board members valued provision for faculty advancement highly, but in terms of effort the innovative are seen as significantly stronger. Board members from innovative schools placed a higher value on innovation and importance of intellectual climate.

6. Board members from both types of schools seemed to place a high value on providing financial incentives but both groups seemed dissatisfied with their efforts in making provisions for them.

Implications

The author has made certain generalizations based on his findings which would seem to have implications for the practice of school administration. These include:

1. Concerning classroom teachers -

Teachers seemed to have certain militant feelings concerning items related to welfare and academic freedom. They were also deeply concerned with the instructional program, both regarding the quality of the program and the materials available for it. They seemed to be searching for leadership in this area and to feel the need for more time to develop good instructional programs. School systems might do well to expand present efforts and to look for new ways to provide such time. Teachers expressed considerable concern about the board's role as a policy maker. This seemed to suggest a need for educating both professional people and laymen concerning the proper functions of board, administration and faculty in the making of policy. Feelings expressed concerning motivational aspects of their schools, particularly those involving encouraging experimentation and the intellectual climate, suggest that development of a sound, positive approach to motivation within the organization. is desirable.

2. Concerning school administrators -

There was a striking similarity of response between administrators of innovative and those of non-innovative schools. The discernible patterns of difference showed that administrators of innovative schools placed more value on articulation of effort, on encouraging experimentation, and on the intellectual climate found in the schools. These may be important factors in determining what makes up an innovative school, particularly as they were singled out by all three groups: teachers, administrators, and board members.

3. Concerning board members -

Board members from both innovative and non-innovative schools indicated a willingness to do more in the area of motivation, but expressed dissatisfaction with efforts in their system. Those in innovative schools indicated sympathy with opinions of teachers and administrators regarding released time, but dissatisfaction with present efforts. In general, a willingness was present regarding motivation. The author hypothesizes that an "activator" is needed to set the proper combination of forces in action.